

Characteristic Surface Data for the Eikonal Equation

Ezra T. Newman and Alejandro Perez

Dept. of Physics and Astronomy,
University of Pittsburgh, Pgh., PA 15260, USA

Sept. 8, 1998

Abstract

A method of solving the eikonal equation, in either flat or curved space-times, with arbitrary Cauchy data, is extended to the case of data given on a characteristic surface. We find a beautiful relationship between the Cauchy and characteristic data for the same solution, namely they are related by a Legendre transformation. From the resulting solutions, we study and describe the wave-front singularities that are associated with their level surfaces (the characteristic surfaces or “big wave-fronts”).

1 Introduction

The high frequency limit of the wave equation is given by the eikonal equation, written in an arbitrary space-time as:

$$g^{ab}(x^a)\partial_a S(x^a)\partial_b S(x^a) = 0 \quad (1)$$

where the $x^a = (x^i, t)$ are any local coordinates, and $g^{ab}(x^a)$ is the metric of the given space-time. The level surfaces of a solution of Eq.(1), $S(x^a) = \text{const.}$, (which need not be smooth every place and could have self-intersections) are three dimensional characteristic surfaces (the “big wave-fronts” in the terminology of Arnold[1]), and the sections $t = \text{constant}$ of

these surfaces are the two-dimensional (“small”) wave fronts. The vector field $l^a = g^{ab}\partial_b S$ is tangent to the null geodesic that generate the characteristic surfaces.

In flat space-time the eikonal equation becomes

$$\eta^{ab}\partial_a S\partial_b S = (\partial_t S)^2 - (\partial_x S)^2 - (\partial_y S)^2 - (\partial_z S)^2 = 0. \quad (2)$$

In Sec.2 we review the method [2] to give a general solution of the eikonal equation in flat space-time adapted to appropriate Cauchy data given at $t = t_0$. In Sec.3 we modify the method so that the eikonal equation is solved with arbitrary *characteristic* data given at null infinity. The relation between both methods is studied in Sec.4 where we find that the Cauchy and characteristic data are related by a Legendre transformation. The wave-front singularities of the level surfaces of the resulting solutions are described parametrically in Sec.5 and finally the generalization of our results to asymptotically flat spaces-times is given in Sec.6.

2 Solutions of the Eikonal Equation

From the point of view of the theory of partial differential equation the eikonal equation is a homogeneous first order non-linear partial differential equation; there exist a solution S^* , called ‘complete integral’, depending on three arbitrary constants[3], e.g., in flat space-time the function

$$S^*(x^i, t, \alpha_i) = x^i \alpha^i - t \sum (\alpha_i)^2 \quad (3)$$

is easily seen to satisfy (2).

Remark 1. *The fact that the equation is homogeneous plays no role in this section, but will be crucial in the generalization to characteristic data.*

Remark 2. *From now on we will treat the problem of the eikonal in flat space; we leave the discussion of general space-times to the end.*

It is possible to generate a “general integral”, i.e., a solution of the eikonal equation depending on an arbitrary function, by means of the following pro-

cedure: First, define the function $S^{**}(x^i, t, \alpha_i)$ of the coordinates and the free parameters α_i as

$$S^{**}(x^i, t, \alpha_i) \equiv S^*(x^i, t, \alpha_i) - H(\alpha_i), \quad (4)$$

where $H(\alpha_i)$ is any function of the α_i 's.

Next, think of the α_i 's as functions of the space-time points obtained from the following conditions:

$$\partial S^{**}/\partial \alpha_i = \partial S^*/\partial \alpha_i - \partial H/\partial \alpha_i = 0 \quad (5)$$

Equation (5) determine the space-time dependence of the α_i 's ($\alpha_i = A_i(x^i, t)$) given that

$$\left| \frac{\partial^2 S^{**}(x^i, t, \alpha_i)}{\partial \alpha_i \partial \alpha_j} \right| \neq 0. \quad (6)$$

This condition can fail in lower dimensional regions called the caustics. This issue will be returned to in Sec.5.

Substituting $\alpha_i = A_i(x^i, t)$ into equation (4) we eliminate the α_i , and obtain

$$S^{**}(x^i, t) = S^*(x^i, t, A_i(x^i, t)) - H(A_i(x^i, t)). \quad (7)$$

It is easy to verify that, because of the condition (5),

$$\partial_a S^{**} = \partial_a S^* \quad (8)$$

which means that $S^{**}(x^i, t)$ is a new solution of the eikonal equation (1) determined by an arbitrary function H . We can determine the free function H so that the solution (7) satisfies initial Cauchy data at $t = t_0$. We denote the Cauchy data by $S_{Cauchy}(x^i)$. Conditions (5) imply that at $t = t_0$, $\alpha_i = \partial S_{Cauchy}/\partial x^i$. Inverting these relations we obtain $x^i = X^i(\alpha_i)$, and replacing them in (7) at $t = t_0$ we find the sought for relation:

$$H(\alpha_i) = S^*(X^i(\alpha_i), t_0, \alpha_i) - S_{Cauchy}(X^i(\alpha_i)). \quad (9)$$

This last equation relates the arbitrary function $H(\alpha_i)$ with the Cauchy data, $S_{Cauchy}(x^i)$, at $t = t_0$ and allows us to construct solutions of the eikonal

equation in flat space-time for any initial data.

We now change the set of the α^i 's for new parameters that are more appropriate to the study of asymptotically flat spaces and we rewrite our previous equations in terms of them. A complete integral of the eikonal equation, equation (1), can be written in terms of new parameters $(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ as:

$$S^*(x^a, \beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = \beta x^a l_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}). \quad (10)$$

where

$$l_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}(1 + \zeta\bar{\zeta})}((1 + \zeta\bar{\zeta}), (\zeta + \bar{\zeta}), -i(\zeta - \bar{\zeta}), (\zeta\bar{\zeta} - 1)) \quad (11)$$

is the null covector pointing in the $(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ direction. The $(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ are the stereographic coordinates that parametrize the sphere of null directions.

From (10) and (11), we get the relations between the new parameters $(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$, and the old α 's:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 &= \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\zeta + \bar{\zeta}}{1 + \zeta\bar{\zeta}} \\ \alpha_2 &= -i \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\zeta - \bar{\zeta}}{1 + \zeta\bar{\zeta}} \\ \alpha_3 &= \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\zeta\bar{\zeta} - 1}{1 + \zeta\bar{\zeta}}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

and

$$\beta = \sqrt{2 \sum \alpha_i^2} \quad (13)$$

In terms of the new parameters Eq.(4) reads:

$$S^{**}(x^a, \beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = \beta x^a l_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}), \quad (14)$$

where $H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ is an arbitrary function that will be determined by the initial conditions. Conditions (5) on $(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ become

$$x^a l_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - \frac{\partial H}{\partial \beta}(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})|_{\zeta, \bar{\zeta}} = 0 \quad (15)$$

$$\beta x^a m_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - \eth H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})|_\beta = 0 \quad (16)$$

$$\beta x^a \bar{m}_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - \bar{\eth} H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})|_\beta = 0. \quad (17)$$

Remark 3. *We have replaced the derivatives with respect to ζ and $\bar{\zeta}$ respectively by*

$$\begin{aligned} \eth &= (1 + \zeta \bar{\zeta}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta}, \\ \bar{\eth} &= (1 + \zeta \bar{\zeta}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\zeta}} \end{aligned}$$

and used the fact that $\eth l_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = m_a$ and $\bar{\eth} \bar{l}_a = n_a - l_a$ where $(l_a, n_a, m_a, \bar{m}_a)$ form a null Minkowski space tetrad for each $(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$.

The function $H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ can be determined by means of the same procedure using the conditions $\alpha_i = \partial S_{Cauchy} / \partial x^i$ at $t = t_0$ and relations (12) to obtain the $x^i = X^i(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$, and finally rewriting (9)

$$H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = S^*(X^i(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}), t_0, \beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - S_{Cauchy}(X^i(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})).$$

3 Characteristic Data for the Eikonal Equation

The eikonal equation, being hyperbolic, admits a characteristic formulation. Even though the results of this section can be applied to any characteristic hypersurface in Minkowski, in flat space (as in any asymptotically simple space-time) there are two preferred characteristic surfaces, namely future and past null infinity respectively. In the following we will formulate the characteristic problem in terms of data given at future null infinity, $\mathfrak{I}^+$. $\mathfrak{I}^+$ has the topology of $S^2 \times R$; we choose Bondi coordinates on it, namely $(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ on the S^2 and the retarded time u_B along R . In an analogous manner as for the Cauchy problem, the characteristic data at future null infinity will be defined by a function of $(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$;

$$S_{Characteristic} = L(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}). \quad (18)$$

The goal of this section is to develop a method to construct solutions of the eikonal equation geometrically adapted to the characteristic data, Eq.(18), at $\mathfrak{I}^+$.

Remark 4. *In asymptotically flat space-times, in the neighborhood of future null infinity, $\mathfrak{I}^+$, there is a preferred class of coordinates referred to as Bondi coordinates. Given a Bondi system $(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ at $\mathfrak{I}^+$, a new system[4] $(u, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ can be defined by $(u, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = (L(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}), \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$. The characteristic data, (18), can be thought of as being generated by this coordinate change representing a one parameter family of arbitrary $u = \text{const.}$ slices of $\mathfrak{I}^+$.*

In flat space-times we can define a two parameters family of null surfaces by:

$$S^* = x^a l_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) \quad (19)$$

As was pointed out in [2] Eq.(19) has a dual interpretation. For $(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ kept constant, its level surfaces define null planes intersecting the time axis at a time equal the value of S^* and with its direction given by $(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$; on the other hand, for a fixed value of x^a it represents the light cone cut at $\mathfrak{I}^+$ of the space time point x^a in the interior, i.e., it represents the intersection of the null cone from x^a with $\mathfrak{I}^+$.

We can think of the characteristic data (18) geometrically, as defining a one parameter family of cuts at $\mathfrak{I}^+$ in terms of $u = L(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = \text{const.}$ (It is assumed that this can be inverted so that the cuts are given by $u_B = L^{-1}(u = \text{const}, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$.) With this point of view, we construct a solution of the eikonal equation (1) (corresponding to the characteristic data $L(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$), such that the family of null surfaces in the interior are defined by the null geodesics normal to the family of cuts at infinity given by $L(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = \text{const.}$. In order to do so we will generalize the method of section II.

Defining

$$S^{**}(x^a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = L(S^*, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = L(x^a l_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}), \zeta, \bar{\zeta}), \quad (20)$$

we see immediately that it is a solution of the eikonal equation depending on two free parameters. [Note the duplication of notation which arises from the different meanings to the same object; $S^* = u_B = x^a l_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$.] By putting the requirement on ζ and $\bar{\zeta}$ that $\bar{\partial} S^{**} = \bar{\partial} S^{**} = 0$, i.e.,

$$\dot{L}(S^*, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) x^a m_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) + \bar{\partial} L(S^*, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = 0$$

$$\dot{L}(S^*, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) x^a \bar{m}_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) + \bar{\partial} L(S^*, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = 0, \quad (21)$$

where $\dot{L} \equiv \partial_{S^*} L$, we can solve for ζ and $\bar{\zeta}$ in terms of x^a , i.e., equations (21) give us

$$\zeta = \Gamma(x^a) \text{ and } \bar{\zeta} = \bar{\Gamma}(x^a) \quad (22)$$

except at the caustics when [5]

$$\begin{vmatrix} \bar{\partial}^2 S^{**} & \bar{\partial} \bar{\partial} S^{**} \\ \bar{\partial} \bar{\partial} S^{**} & \bar{\partial}^2 S^{**} \end{vmatrix} = 0. \quad (23)$$

This issue will be discussed in Sec.5.

Finally replacing $(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ in (20) and differentiating we find

$$\partial_a S^{**}(x^a, \Gamma(x^a), \bar{\Gamma}(x^a)) = \dot{L} l_a(\Gamma(x^a), \bar{\Gamma}(x^a)). \quad (24)$$

Therefore, the function

$$S^{**}(x^a, \Gamma(x^a), \bar{\Gamma}(x^a)) \quad (25)$$

satisfies the eikonal equation, and by construction (20) it is adapted to the characteristic data defined by the function $L(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ at $\mathfrak{I}^+$. The null normals to level surfaces

$$S^{**}(x^a, \Gamma(x^a), \bar{\Gamma}(x^a)) = \text{const.} \quad (26)$$

are normal to the cuts $L(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = \text{const.}$ at $\mathfrak{I}^+$. Note that the fact that $S^{**}(x^a)$ is a new solution of the eikonal equation is a consequence of property of the eikonal equation of being homogeneous in $\partial_a S$.

4 Relation between the Cauchy and Characteristic Constructions

In this section we give the connection between the two methods of construction. Earlier we showed how to relate the Cauchy data, $S_{Cauchy}(x^i)$, with the arbitrary function $H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ of Sec.2, so that any solution of the eikonal equation can be cast in the form of equation (14). Therefore, there must be a relationship of the characteristic construction to the construction via Cauchy

data and hence a relationship between the functions $L(x^a l_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}), \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ and $H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$.

We first note that though in both methods there is an arbitrary function of three variables, in the characteristic method there appear only two parameters $(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ while in the Cauchy method there are the three $(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$.

We can reduce the three to two by solving Eq.(15)

$$x^a l_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - \frac{\partial H}{\partial \beta}(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = 0, \quad (27)$$

for $\beta = \beta(x^a l_a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ or changing notation and using $u_B = x^a l_a$, we have $\beta = \beta(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$. Now thinking of (27) as an implicit relation defining *either* $u_B = U(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) \equiv \frac{\partial H}{\partial \beta}(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ or $\beta = \beta(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$. Note that if we treat H as a function of $(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$, i.e., $H = H(\beta(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}), \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ then

$$\dot{H} \equiv \partial_{u_B} H|_{\zeta, \bar{\zeta}} = \frac{\partial H}{\partial \beta}(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) \dot{\beta} \quad (28)$$

or

$$\dot{\beta} = \frac{\dot{H}}{\frac{\partial H}{\partial \beta}} \quad (29)$$

We replace $\beta = \beta(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ into the two conditions, Eqs.(16) and (17), obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) x^a m_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - \eth H(\beta(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}), \zeta, \bar{\zeta})|_{\beta} &= 0 \\ \beta(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) x^a \bar{m}_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - \eth H(\beta(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}), \zeta, \bar{\zeta})|_{\beta} &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

which appear similar to Eqs.(21), namely:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{L}(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) x^a m_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) + \eth L(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})|_{u_B} &= 0 \\ \dot{L}(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) x^a \bar{m}_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) + \eth L(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})|_{u_B} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

We explicitly write $|_{\beta}$ and $|_{u_B}$ in the $\eth$ -operators to mean that the angular derivatives are taken keeping β or u_B constant respectively; also $\dot{L}$ means $\partial_{u_B} L|_{\zeta, \bar{\zeta}}$ for any $L(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$.

Remark 5 *As we mentioned earlier, Eqs.(30) or (31) implicitly define $\zeta = \Gamma(x^a)$ and $\bar{\zeta} = \bar{\Gamma}(x^a)$ everywhere except at the caustics. They can be approached in a limiting fashion.*

Given an arbitrary function $F(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ and $\beta(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ there is the following relation between differential operators.

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\partial}F(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})|_{\beta} &= \bar{\partial}F(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})|_{u_B} - (\partial F/\partial\beta)(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) \bar{\partial}\beta|_{u_B} \\ \bar{\partial}F(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})|_{\beta} &= \bar{\partial}F(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})|_{u_B} - (\partial F/\partial\beta)(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) \bar{\partial}\beta|_{u_B}.\end{aligned}\quad (32)$$

Using these relations to replace the $\bar{\partial}$ and $\bar{\partial}$ derivative operators at β constant by operators at u_B constant in (31) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}\beta x^a m_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - \bar{\partial}H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})|_{u_B} + (\partial H/\partial\beta)(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) \bar{\partial}\beta|_{u_B} &= 0 \\ \beta x^a m_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - \bar{\partial}H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})|_{u_B} + (\partial H/\partial\beta)(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) \bar{\partial}\beta|_{u_B} &= 0.\end{aligned}\quad (33)$$

Applying relations (32) to the function $F = u_B = x^a l_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$, thought of as $u_B = U(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$, via the following steps;

$$\bar{\partial}F(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})|_{\beta} = \bar{\partial}(x^a l_a) = x^a m_a \quad (34)$$

$$\bar{\partial}F(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})|_u = \bar{\partial}u|_u = 0 \quad (35)$$

$$(\partial F/\partial\beta) \bar{\partial}\beta|_{u_B} = (\partial u/\partial\beta) \bar{\partial}\beta|_{u_B} = \dot{\beta}^{-1} \bar{\partial}\beta|_{u_B} \quad (36)$$

we get the following important equation:

$$\dot{\beta} x^a m_a = - \bar{\partial}\beta|_{u_B}. \quad (37)$$

Finally inserting this relation, with Eq.(29), into (33) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\beta x^a m_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - \bar{\partial}H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})|_{u_B} - \dot{H} x^a m_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) &= 0 \\ \beta x^a m_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - \bar{\partial}H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})|_{u_B} - \dot{H} x^a \bar{m}_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) &= 0,\end{aligned}\quad (38)$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\partial}(u_B\beta - H)|_{u_B} + (u_B\dot{\beta} - H)x^am_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) &= 0 \\ \bar{\partial}(u_B\beta - H)|_{u_B} + (u_B\dot{\beta} - H)x^a\bar{m}_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) &= 0.\end{aligned}\tag{39}$$

Comparing Eq.(39) with (31) we see that they are identical when we set

$$L(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = u_B\beta(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - H(\beta(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}), \zeta, \bar{\zeta}).\tag{40}$$

From equation (27) we also have that

$$\begin{aligned}u_B &= \partial H / \partial \beta, \\ \beta &= \partial L / \partial u_B.\end{aligned}\tag{41}$$

We see that the two data functions $L(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ and $H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ are related by the Legendre transformation, Eqs.(40) and (41). We have finally arrived at a very simple and beautiful relation between the two methods. An essential property of the eikonal equation for this relationship is that it is homogeneous in $\partial_a S$.

5 Parametric Description of the Wave-Fronts

Using the methods described above we can construct a general solution of the eikonal equation either for the Cauchy or the (corresponding) characteristic data. In the last section we showed that they are simply related by a Legendre transformation in the variables u_B and β . Once we have the solution of the eikonal equation we can study the geometry of its wave-fronts. In particular we are interested in the description of the singularities developed by them, namely, its caustics.

A key step in both methods consists of expressing the free parameters, e.g., $(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$, contained in the formalism as functions of the space-time points, x^a . In many cases the problem of inverting Eq.(15-17) or Eq.(21) in order to get either $(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ or $(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ as functions of the space-time coordinates x^a , can be a formidable task and at times impossible. However, it is not absolutely necessary, since it is possible to give a parametric description of

the null surfaces defined by Eq.(14) or Eq.(25) respectively (In the sequel we follow the path given in ref.[2] for the case of the stationary eikonal equation).

In the Cauchy case we have three parameters $(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}, \beta)$ in the initial data for the eikonal equation. See Eq.(14). We introduce the new parameter r together with $(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}, \beta)$ by means of the following equation;

$$r = \beta^{-1} \bar{\partial} \bar{\partial} S^{**} = x^a (n_a - l_a) - \beta^{-1} \bar{\partial} \bar{\partial} H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})|_{\beta} \quad (42)$$

and the previous equations;

$$\begin{aligned} x^a l_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - \frac{\partial H}{\partial \beta}(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})|_{\zeta, \bar{\zeta}} &= 0, \\ \beta x^a m_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - \bar{\partial} H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) &= 0, \\ \beta x^a \bar{m}_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - \bar{\partial} H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

The four Eqs.(43) and (42) can be solved for the coordinates x^a in terms of $(\beta, r, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$, using the orthonormality of the null tetrad:

$$x^a = \frac{\partial H}{\partial \beta} (l^a + n^a) - (r - \frac{\bar{\partial} \bar{\partial} H}{\beta}) l^a - \frac{\bar{\partial} H}{\beta} m^a - \frac{\bar{\partial} H}{\beta} \bar{m}^a. \quad (44)$$

Equation (44) is not very convenient for the analysis of the wave fronts because the parameter β does not have a simple geometric meaning related with the null surfaces. On the other hand, as we know, the level surfaces of $S^{**} = u = \text{const}$ in Eq.(14) define the null surfaces in which we are interested. Therefore, a sensible parameterization will be the one that replaces the β with the parameter u defined by

$$u = \beta x^a l_a - H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = L(x^a l_a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}). \quad (45)$$

Constant values of u label the characteristic surfaces themselves and are different than $u_B = x^a l_a$. By changing the parameter β in favor of u we are switching to the characteristic description which provides a better framework to study the dynamics of the wave fronts.

Remark 6 Note that $r \equiv \beta^{-1} \bar{\partial} \bar{\partial} S^{**} = \beta^{-1} \bar{\partial} \bar{\partial} u$ defines an affine parameter along the null geodesics that rule the characteristic surfaces $u = \text{const}$.

Instead of performing the transformation from the “Cauchy parameterization” to the new set $(u, r, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ we take a shortcut, and start directly with the characteristic approach. Using the notation of the previous sections for the characteristic problem the new parameters are determined by the previous equations:

$$u = u(x^a) = L(x^a l_a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}), \quad (46)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{L}(x^a l_a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) x^a m_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) + \bar{\partial} L(x^a l_a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) &= 0 \\ \dot{L}(x^a l_a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) x^a \bar{m}_a(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) + \bar{\partial} L(x^a l_a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

and the new one defined by $r = \dot{L}^{-1} \bar{\partial} \bar{\partial} S^{**}$ yielding

$$r = x^a (n_a - l_a) + \frac{\bar{\partial} \dot{L}}{\dot{L}} x^a m_a + \frac{\bar{\partial} \dot{L}}{\dot{L}} x^a \bar{m}_a + \frac{\ddot{L}}{\dot{L}} x^a x^b m_a \bar{m}_b + \frac{\bar{\partial} \bar{\partial} L}{\dot{L}}. \quad (48)$$

The coordinates x^a can be written in terms of the four parameters u, r, ζ and $\bar{\zeta}$ as

$$x^a = u_B (l^a + n^a) + (r + \bar{\partial} \Phi + \bar{\Phi} \dot{\Phi}) l^a - \bar{\Phi} m^a - \Phi \bar{m}^a, \quad (49)$$

where

$$\Phi \equiv -\frac{\bar{\partial} L}{\dot{L}}, \quad (50)$$

and the function $u_B \equiv x^a l_a$ is written in terms of the parameters u, ζ and $\bar{\zeta}$ implicitly by $u = L(x^a l_a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$, i.e., $x^a l_a = L^{-1}(u, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$. (L^{-1} denotes the inverse *function* of L .)

Treating Eq.(49) as a coordinate transformation between the natural coordinates associated with the solution, i.e., the $(u, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}, r)$, and the standard space-time coordinates x^a , the transformation breaks down when its Jacobian vanishes. This is a three-surface in the space-time; the caustic set associated with the solution.

After a lengthy calculation we find that this occurs when

$$J = \frac{\partial(t, x, y, z)}{\partial(u, r, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})} = r^2 - \sigma^0 \bar{\sigma}^0 = 0, \quad (51)$$

where

$$\sigma^0 = \bar{\partial}\Phi + \Phi\dot{\bar{\Phi}}. \quad (52)$$

This is equivalent to Eq.(3.1) of reference[4].

There is a simple geometric interpretation of Eq.(51) and (52); the shear function σ of the congruence of null geodesics that generate the surfaces $u = \text{constant}$, with the affine parameter r , is given by [6]

$$\sigma = \frac{\sigma^0}{r^2 - \sigma^0 \bar{\sigma}^0}.$$

Therefore, the vanishing of the Jacobian (51) implies that the shear of the congruence diverges. We regain the expression defining caustics from ref.[2] in the stationary case, namely,

$$r^2 - \bar{\partial}^2 L \bar{\partial}^2 L = 0, \quad (53)$$

since $\sigma^0 = \bar{\partial}^2 L$.

The form of the metric tensor in the new coordinates is

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= \eta_{ab} dx^a dx^b \\ &= 2 \frac{du}{\dot{L}} \left\{ dr + du \left(\frac{1 + \bar{\partial}\bar{\Phi} + \Phi\bar{\Phi}}{\dot{L}} \right) \right. \\ &\quad + d\bar{\zeta} \left(\frac{\bar{\partial}\bar{\sigma}^0 + \Phi\bar{\sigma}^0 - \dot{\Phi}\bar{\sigma}^0 + \bar{\Phi}r}{P} \right) + d\zeta \left(\frac{\bar{\partial}\sigma^0 + \bar{\Phi}\sigma^0 - \dot{\bar{\Phi}}\sigma^0 + \dot{\Phi}r}{P} \right) \Big\} \\ &\quad - \frac{2r}{P^2} (\sigma^0 d\zeta^2 + \bar{\sigma}^0 d\bar{\zeta}^2) - 2(r^2 + \sigma^0 \bar{\sigma}^0) \frac{d\zeta d\bar{\zeta}}{P^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

where $P = 1 + \zeta\bar{\zeta}$. This line element, corresponding to shearing non-stationary null coordinates, defined by Eq.(49) reduces to the one given in ref.[2] in the stationary regime. As pointed out in this reference it might be of interest to use Eq.(54) as a background metric in linearized gravity for higher order perturbations in problems where gravitational radiation is important.

6 The Eikonal Equation in Asymptotically Flat Space-Times

In a straightforward manner all our results can be generalized to the case of arbitrary curved space-times, and the proofs of all the relation above follow basically the same path. We will assume that there is given a system of local coordinates x^a in an arbitrary curved space-time and a two parameter family (sphere's worth) of solutions of the eikonal equation, i.e. $Z(x^a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ such that

$$g^{ab}(x^a)\partial_a Z(x^a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})\partial_b Z(x^a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = 0 \quad (55)$$

such that its (null) gradient sweeps out the light-cone at x^a as $(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ range over the sphere.

Such characteristic function $S = Z(x^a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ are one of the main variables of the Null Surface Formulation of General Relativity; they contain all the conformal information of the space-time [7]. In the special case of asymptotically flat space-times $Z(x^a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ can be interpreted either as the light cone cut of $\mathcal{I}^+$ of the point with coordinates x^a , or as the past light cone of a point at $\mathcal{I}^+$ with coordinates $(u, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ [7].

We take the complete solution $\beta Z(x^a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$, and define, in an analogous manner to the flat-space construction,

$$u = S^{**}(x^a, \beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = \beta Z(x^a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}). \quad (56)$$

On Eq.(56) we impose the conditions, equivalent to (15),(16) and (17), namely,

$$\frac{\partial S^{**}}{\partial \beta} = Z(x^a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - \frac{\partial H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})}{\partial \beta} = 0 \quad (57)$$

$$\partial S^{**} = \beta \partial Z(x^a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - \partial H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = 0 \quad (58)$$

$$\bar{\partial} S^{**} = \beta \bar{\partial} Z(x^a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - \bar{\partial} H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = 0, \quad (59)$$

and solve for $(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ (as earlier, always possible aside from lower dimensional (caustic) regions which can be approached in a limiting fashion) in terms of the x^a .

When these are resubstituted into Eq.(56), S^{**} then becomes a new solution of the eikonal equation since

$$\partial_a S^{**} = \beta \partial_a Z. \quad (60)$$

As in the flat case, we can determine the arbitrary function $H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ in terms of corresponding data given on a Cauchy surface Σ . Suppose that we are given a coordinate system (τ, x^i) such that $\tau = \tau_0$ corresponds to our Cauchy surface, together with suitable Cauchy data $S_{Cauchy}(x^i)$ on Σ . A needed generalization of the relationship $\alpha_i = \partial S_{Cauchy} / \partial x^i$ from Sec.2 is

$$\frac{\partial S_{Cauchy}(x^i)}{\partial x^i} - \frac{\beta \partial Z(x^i, \tau_0, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})}{\partial x^i} = 0. \quad (61)$$

which is to be considered as three equations for the determination of x^i in terms of $(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$, i.e., $x^i = X^i(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$. When these are inserted into Eq.(56) at $\tau = \tau_0$ we obtain

$$H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = \beta Z(X^i(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}), \tau_0, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - S_{Cauchy}(X^i(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})).$$

in analogy to the results of Sec.2.

The characteristic formulation from Sec.3 is even simpler. Starting with any function $L(u_B, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ defined on $\mathfrak{I}^+$, we obtain a solution to the eikonal equation with the given characteristic data by

$$u = S^{**}(x^a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = L(Z(x^a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}), \zeta, \bar{\zeta}), \quad (62)$$

where $(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ are functions of the coordinates x^a such that the equivalent to Eq.(21) hold, i.e. when

$$\bar{\partial} S^{**} = \dot{L} \bar{\partial} Z(x^a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - \bar{\partial} L(Z, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = 0 \quad (63)$$

$$\bar{\partial} S^{**} = \dot{L} \bar{\partial} Z(x^a, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - \bar{\partial} L(Z, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = 0. \quad (64)$$

Again the relationship between $H(\beta, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ and $L(u, \zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ is given by the Legendre transformation

$$L(Z, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = Z\beta(Z, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - H(\beta(Z, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}), \zeta, \bar{\zeta}). \quad (65)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \partial H / \partial \beta, \\ \beta &= \partial L / \partial Z. \end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

7 Conclusion

We have generalized the results of ref.[2] concerning solutions of the flat-space eikonal equation. We saw two different means of giving data and solving the eikonal equation: the Cauchy, and the characteristic formulation. Each one leads to different methods. The two methods are beautifully related by a Legendre transformation, Eqs.(40) and (41). Moreover, all our results can be generalized to the case of curved space-times. The characteristic formulation appears to be better for the study of the dynamics of the wave fronts. By means of a suitable parameterization we could describe the caustics in the wave-fronts, and find a simple geometric interpretation in terms of the shear σ of the null congruence generating the wave fronts.

8 Acknowledgments

ETN thanks the NSF for support under grant #PHY 97-22049 and AP thanks FUNDACION YPF, Argentina, for its support. We extend our appreciation to Simonetta Frittelli for many stimulating conversations.

References

- [1] V.I Arnold, *Catastrophe Theory*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, NY, Tokyo, (1986).
- [2] Simonetta Frittelli, Ezra T. Newman and Gilberto Silva-Ortigoza, *The Eikonal Equation in Flat Space; Null Surfaces and Their Singularities*, accepted for publication in JMP.
- [3] L. Landau and Lifschitz, *Classical Mechanics*, Pergamon Press, Headington Hill Hall, Oxford, 4, 5 Fitzroy Sq. London, W.1, (1960).

- [4] B. Aronson, R. Lind, J. Messmer, and E.T. Newman, J. Math. Phys., **12**, 2462, (1971).
- [5] V.I Arnold, *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, NY, Tokyo, (1980).
- [6] R.W. Lind and E.T. Newman, J. Math. Phys., **15**, 1103, (1974).
- [7] S. Fritelli, C. Kozameh and E.T. Newman, J. Math. Phys. **36**, 4984, (1995).